

Atty. Dkt. No. 048674-0153

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on May 8, 2003 in which claims 1-19 were rejected. With this amendment, claims 1, 6, and 12 are amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons which follow.

I. Examiner Interview

On July 10, 2003, Applicant's attorney conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner to discuss the substance of the Office Action. The amendments to claims 1, 6, and 12 are intended to reflect the outcome of the interview by clarifying the structure of the "liner lock" in the independent claims. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct the interview.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as Anticipated by Taylor.

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Taylor, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 5,331,741. With this reply, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 6, and 12 to overcome the rejection based on Taylor. Claims 1, 6, and 12, as amended, recite a "liner lock comprising a base having a spring arm extending therefrom" and an "eccentric adjustment mechanism" coupled to the liner lock. Taylor does not disclose a "liner lock comprising a base having a spring arm extending therefrom" and an "eccentric adjustment mechanism" coupled to the liner lock. The Examiner refers to element 32 in the Taylor reference as the "liner lock" in the present Office Action. However, Applicant respectfully asserts that element 32 is a "blade opening lever" that is not a "liner lock comprising a base having a spring arm extending therefrom" as recited in the amended independent claims. See Taylor, col. 4, lines 62-64 and FIG. 4. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 6, and 12, and corresponding dependent claims 7 and 15 are not anticipated by Taylor and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Atty. Dkt. No. 048674-0153

III. Rejection of Claims 2-5, 8-11, and 16-19 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Based Upon Taylor

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected dependent claims 2-5, 8-11, and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Taylor, Jr. in view of the assertion that "fastening components having the recited structure are old and well known in the art and provide various well known benefits including providing a more secure connection while facilitating removal and operation thereof." As discussed above, independent claims 1, 6, and 12 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Taylor. The facts cited by the Examiner do not overcome the deficiencies of Taylor because Taylor does not disclose a "liner lock comprising a base having a spring arm extending therefrom" and an "eccentric adjustment mechanism" coupled to the liner lock as recited in independent claims 1, 6, and 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully presents dependent claims 2-5, 8-11, and 16-19 for reconsideration and allowance.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-12 and 15-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 13 and 14 are withdrawn. With this reply, claims 1, 6, and 12 are amended. Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Atty. Dkt. No. 048674-0153

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 8/5/03By 

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 26371



26371

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (414) 297-5897

Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Jeffrey S. Gundersen
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,619